

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

**PIN:** 6456  
**APPLICANT NAME:** Alameda County Water District (ACWD)  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Phase 2 Niles Cone Water Supply, Groundwater Recharge and Fish Passage Project

**FUNDS REQUESTED:** \$10,620,000  
**COST MATCH:** \$ 1,180,000  
**TOTAL PROJECT COST:** \$11,800,000

**DESCRIPTION:** Groundwater Basin Region while also providing for anadromous fish passage into the Alameda Creek Watershed, the largest local drainage tributary to San Francisco Bay.

**Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.**

Pass

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1.** 5

The application meets the IRWMP content standards through the development and adoption of the Niles Cone Groundwater Basin IRWMP FED. The IRWMP was adopted by all four participating agencies; three have statutory authority over water management. The IRWMP was adopted by all the Partner Agencies in June and July 2005. Signed copies of the adoption resolutions are in Attachment 3.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

This region is a small portion of the Bay Area region in which the applicant also participates. The application displays the region, groundwater basin, watershed and internal boundaries of water related infrastructure with accompanying narratives. A land-use map could not be found. The integrated relationships between water facilities and natural resources are the basis for why the region is appropriate for water management. The water quality and quantity of the groundwater basin are only briefly discussed. Only the water quantity from a desalination plant is given. Water supplies and demands for a 20 to 35-year planning horizon are presented. Environmental resources are discussed, but ecological processes are not. The application includes the social and cultural makeup, economic conditions, and a table that depicts economic and employment in the region, but only briefly discusses cultural or social factors.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

The applicant identifies the regional planning objectives and lists the documents where the objectives were derived. The FED addresses major water supply availability and reliability issues which the applicant states will lead to a reduction of conflict between need for water for fish habitat and passage and municipal water supply. The discussion does not describe how the objectives are determined as a group, except that they are reviewed by the individual partner agencies.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1.** 3

The applicant breaks down the existing planning documents they have among the applicable water management strategies (i.e., water supply reliability, water quality, etc.). The applicant appears to address each of the strategies listed in the Guidelines. The IRWMP does not discuss how the strategies/projects work together and provide added benefits of integration of multiple water management strategies.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.** 3

The discussion of regional priorities can not be easily determined from the IRWMP, as the regional priorities are not broken out and addressed separately. The priorities are lumped together with the objectives. In this part of the application, the applicant does not discuss short- and long-term priorities. In another section of the IRWMP, they list some projects as having high, medium, or low priority. A discussion on how decision making will be responsive to regional changes could not be found in the IRWMP. This proposal is also contained in PIN 6770.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant provided a table of the projects that includes timeframes, the cooperating agencies, and costs. The linkages between projects are not demonstrated or identified very well. The economic and technical feasibility were only marginally addressed. The institutional structure was not specifically addressed.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The application discusses benefits to fisheries and recreational resources, but does not discuss impacts to other resources. Some regional benefits are addressed, but no comment was found as to the advantages of regional plan as opposed to individual local efforts. The application does not discuss DACs. The application implies that the negative impacts of the IRWMP are addressed by the CEQA process. A further discussion of how CEQA would address potential negative impacts would have gained a higher score for this criterion.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The applicant discusses general data types and an analytical tool that was used in the planning process. No discussion of technical methods used is presented. It appears other analytical tools could have been used. Data gaps are identified in the deeper aquifer system in the northern portion of the region. Monitoring systems that will gather performance data are discussed. The applicant states that plans, reports, and activities have mechanisms to adapt project operation and IRWMP implementation based on performance data collected, but the mechanisms are not described. Appropriate metrics are identified. The applicant is well positioned to document results on groundwater protection and levels.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant appears to have several systems for managing regional data. They address the existing monitoring efforts for both water quality and quantity. They do not address supporting statewide needs or integration into SWAMP or GAMA. They have methods in place for sharing the data with the public, but they do not identify a central place for providing the data for all projects in one place. The public will have to go to different places to view the data.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant provides the project costs and the funding agency in Table 10 of the application. They do not specifically address the ongoing support and financing of O&M for the projects. This section requires a lengthier discussion and is not adequately addressed. Beneficiaries are not discussed.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The documentation that is being used to establish the IRWMP consists entirely of other local planning documents. Each of the projects and studies can be referenced back to specific documents. Each of the planning documents has been related to an IRWM water management strategy.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant discusses how stakeholder participation is incorporated into the development of the supporting documents with the same examples cited throughout the proposal. They do not discuss the process for inclusion of stakeholders in the IRWMP or how they participate in planning. They do not address public outreach or mechanisms to facilitate stakeholder involvement. They do not discuss environmental justice issues, or DACs. However, they do discuss coordination with State and federal agencies.

### Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

### Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

12

The applicant's proposal consists of one project, which is discussed very well, and it is consistent with the project listed in the FED. The project will address three objectives additional local water supplies for groundwater recharge, improved groundwater management and operations, and improved fish passage. The applicant discusses compliance with environmental review requirements; however, they do not discuss integration with other projects in the region. The proposal will provide source water protection through groundwater recharge. They do provide a graph that demonstrated the improved water supply captured for groundwater recharge. This project only minimally addresses water quality.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

8

Table 10 in the IRWMP lists regional projects and their priority as being high, medium, or low. The proposed project is one of three high priority projects listed in the IRWMP. All three high priority projects listed in the IRWMP are shown as having Proposition 50 as their funding source. One of the other two projects is included in another IRWM Step 1 proposal, and the other project is seeking Desalination funding. The proposed project Phase 2; Phase 1 is stated as being funded, in part, through a grant from National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, and is expected to be completed by the end of 2006.

### Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

4

Attachment 7 Table 1 appears reasonable. The applicant describes how the money will be spent and lists the task item number from the work plan for each category. Table 1 shows land costs, planning and design costs, construction costs, and funding match. Table 1 also lists non-state source of match funds. Four additional cost categories are given. The construction costs appear to be reasonable. However, the contingency costs appear unreasonable.

### Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

4

Attachment 8 provides a schedule for the implementation of the proposal. Each tasks time frame is given in quarterly increments. Attachment 8 does not show the schedule for the Phase 1 of the project which is described in detail in the project proposal discussion.

### Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

8

The proposal discusses current local and imported water supplies. The proposal does not sufficiently discuss future water supply needs as much as it discusses how proposal will reduce demand for imported supplies. The applicant describes three ways how the proposal will meet the water supply strategy needs. The economic, environmental, and fiscal impacts relative to the need for the proposal are marginally addressed. The water supply available for groundwater recharge should be enhanced by up to 1800 ac-ft/y. Multiple watershed objectives will be addressed including fish passage improvement and water supply reliability improvement. In addition, conflict between competing water users will be addressed, by increasing supply and by improving fish habitat and passage.

### Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

6

The applicant is not applying for the funding match waiver, but they did attempt to make connections to the DACs. They believe that securing a water source will reduce the need to buy water in the future and avoid rate increases. There will be public viewing and interpretive centers for the fish passage facilities. However, direct benefits to DACs are not readily apparent from their discussion in the application. The proposal will not directly benefit DACs anymore than other residents residing within the IRWMP's planning region.

### Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The fish passage and groundwater recharge projects are integrated and include multiple benefits. By consolidating points of diversions, obstacles to steelhead (federal threatened species) spawning grounds would be reduced and or eliminated. The proposal will assist in addressing water quality issues (seawater intrusion) in the Niles Cone aquifer.

**TOTAL SCORE: 88**